

Date: Sun, 20 Feb 94 04:30:15 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #76  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sun, 20 Feb 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    76

Today's Topics:

    Dan Pickersgill, Ham Operator and proud of it! (3 msgs)  
Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses) (2 msgs)  
    rec.dan.pickersgill.monologue  
    Remote Control OK on 70cm not on 2m? (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Fri, 18 Feb 94 15:45:46 EST  
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!  
dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Dan Pickersgill, Ham Operator and proud of it!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

> That all depends on how you operate. Around here (meaning RI, in case  
> anyone forgot) if you get on the local "2 meter good buddy box" and  
> start talking about 'motion lotion', the 'super slab', and 'passing  
> you all those golden numbers' (similar to 'golden showers', I wonder?)  
> then you should expect to be treated like the CB transplant you are  
> acting like.

As well they should!

>

> On the other hand, if you don't act like that, then most people won't

> even ask you what license class you have.

Again very appropriate.

> Can you please list the technical contributions the codeless technician  
> license class, or holders thereof, have made to the hobby in the going-on-  
> 3+ years the license class has been around?

Can you please list the accomplishments of coded hams in the last 10.  
(1200 bps Packet is a JOKE, so PLEASE do not use that.)

> Of course, if learning code were hazing you'd have a point. Since it  
> isn't, your argument is moot.

Since it is hazing the argument stands.

> But okay, let's say you have a point, and there should be an alternative  
> for those with no interest in morse. How about a 'manual packet decoding  
> test', where you listen to the packets and decode them?

Just a fair a test as manual morse, lets have both and not grandfather  
anyone. That way you could EARN the right to continued use of the  
spectrum instead of having it handed to you by the 'welfare state  
mentality' of the government.

> No thanks, I prefer rationale debate.

Then could we see some again please.

Dan Pickersgill	N8PKV		Pots have handles,		'Climage is what we
dan@mystis.wariat.org			Magazines have personals,		expect, weather is
ac447@po.cwru.edu			Hams have names.		what we get.' -L. Long

-----  
Date: 18 Feb 1994 16:53:34 -0600

From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo.NeoSoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-  
mail@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Dan Pickersgill, Ham Operator and proud of it!

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Feb18.204241.13892@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,  
Rick Aldom <ayka60@email.sps.mot.com> wrote:

>  
>emergency procedures is needed, do it.....But hanging on the use of CW  
>is hazing pure and simple.

>

>The really good part of these discussions, is I think it will unify the  
>codeless among us, and speed up the process of dumping the code.

Sorry to break this to you, Rick, but Morse testing in the Amateur Service has been around for decades. If it were hazing, as you claim, then hundreds of thousands have been hazed before you.

The real problem is that too many Codeless Techs are too lazy to get up off their collective asses and put forth the effort required to earn a license, as I, Michael, and countless others have. So, they (and you) start whining about how this is hazing, it's not relevant, and whatever other excuse you can come up with not to do it.

--

Radiographers who are able to use a radiographic machine well are great assets to the health care facility in which they are employed.

--Dianne C. DeVos, "Basic Principles of Radiographic Exposure"

-----

Date: Sun, 20 Feb 1994 08:18:10 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa  
Subject: Dan Pickersgill, Ham Operator and proud of it!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>Rick Aldom <ayka60@email.sps.mot.com> writes:

>> As much as  
>> you don't want the change, I predict that within the next few years you  
>> will see more petitions go before the FCC that deal with the insane  
>> requirement of Morse code.

And do you think that those who believe in the necessity of the code test are NOT petitioning the FCC to keep it?

Here, Rick; I'll help you compose a letter to the FCC:

Dear FCC,

I want HF privileges but I don't want to learn the code. Please delete the code test.

Sincerely,  
Rick Aldom

>> The point you missed is that our numbers are  
>> growing,

And you've got all that VHF and UHF spectrum to play with. Learn the code and you'll also have HF.

>> I am a firm believer in peer pressure, but not in hazing  
>> for the fun of it. I have stated before that hazing has a purpose in  
>> life, and in the right place it can be beneficial, but ham radio ain't  
>> the place.....

Ah, the nocode's favorite word: haze. Rick, please look in your dictionary and you'll see the word has no place in this argument.

Next, we'll be hearing the history majors on campus accusing the Math Dept. of 'hazing' because they're required to take one Math class, even though Math has nothing to do with history. Sheesh.  
[Feel free to replace 'history' with any non-science major.]

Jeff NH6IL

-----  
Date: Fri, 18 Feb 94 15:59:06 EST  
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!  
sdd.hp.com!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

> But all these points tell against the Roman alphabet, do they not?  
> Yet written language is not encryption. Or is it? You neglected to  
> say. Maybe we can agree that morse bears most resemblance to a cipher  
> at 5 wpm, and gradually becomes more like spelling aloud (as opposed  
> to spelling on paper, i.e., writing), or even an aural form of the  
> manual alphabet, when you can copy whole words without having to write  
> it down?

So morse is slang english? Is ASCII or EBCDIC? No, it is an encryption method that uses (according to this discussion) a wetware modem. Period.

(If so, how many new languages do you know. Let's see, morse-english, ascii-english, ebcdic-english, hell I even know CBM-ASCII-english though I am not fluent in cbm-ascii-english.)

Dan Pickersgill	N8PKV		Pots have handles,		'Climage is what we
dan@mystis.wariat.org			Magazines have personals,		expect, weather is
ac447@po.cwru.edu			Hams have names.		what we get.' -L. Long





> Again you are only interfering if you transmit over the top of the repeater.

> : The best I've been able to do is to use only one side of the cross-band repeat  
> : feature as a "transmit range extender" for my HT. Usually I can hear the r  
> : output just fine, but I can't make it to the repeater from inside a grocery  
> That's fine but only works when the HT transmits in or above the 220 MHz,  
> band otherwise you would still have to switch bands to control the  
> mobile.

To control, not to use the link. Transmitting on the input of a 2-meter repeater, or a crossband repeater with a 2-meter input and accessing a user function, say the autopatch is perfectly legal.

>  
> cheers,  
> Dan  
> --  
> \*-----\*  
> \* Daniel D. Todd           Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocall.ca.usa           \*  
> \*                           Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu               \*  
> \*                           Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102             \*  
> \*                           Davis CA 95616                         \*  
> \*-----\*  
> \*       The only thing I can officially say for the University is:       \*  
> \*       What I say is in no way related to official University policy   \*  
> \*-----\*  
>

Dan Pickersgill	N8PKV		Pots have handles,		'Climate is what we
dan@mystis.wariat.org			Magazines have personals,		expect, weather is
ac447@po.cwru.edu			Hams have names.		what we get.' -L. Long

-----  
Date: Sat, 19 Feb 1994 01:26:14 GMT  
From: world!dts@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Remote Control OK on 70cm not on 2m?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <HwNyHc5w165w@mystis.wariat.org> dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>ez006683@chip.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

>  
>> I don't understand. I am not suggesting that you ID whole someone else is  
>> xmitting on the repeater input. I assumed that one would only ID when

>> the freq was clear. If you are implying that there is a problem with  
>> transmitting on an empty frequency that happens to have a repeater output  
>> I can't see that as a problem. I would feel comfortable transmitting on  
>> the squelch tail as well, but that may be up for debate. What does the  
>> net think is transmitting on the tail of a repeater intentional interference?  
>  
>Speaking as a repeater trustee, I would not consider that intentional  
>interference as long as the sole purpose was to id the station.  
>  
>> Again you are only interfering if you transmit over the top of the repeater.  
>  
>> : The best I've been able to do is to use only one side of the cross-band rep  
>> : feature as a "transmit range extender" for my HT. Usually I can hear the r  
>> : output just fine, but I can't make it to the repeater from inside a grocery  
>> That's fine but only works when the HT transmits in or above the 220 MHz,  
>> band otherwise you would still have to switch bands to control the  
>> mobile.  
>  
>To control, not to use the link. Transmitting on the input of a 2-meter  
>repeater, or a crossband repeater with a 2-meter input and accessing a  
>user function, say the autopatch is perfectly leagle.

This is true, but it is still necessary to have some means other than the  
2 meter frequency to control the crossband repeating station. Repeaters  
are supposed to have some means other than the primary frequency for  
control. It could either be a radio frequency above 220, or it could be  
a telephone line. With a crossband repeater in the car, it'll need to either  
be something in your cellphone, or the uhf side of the radio.

With all of this discussion we've not adressed the issue of where on 2 meters  
you'd operate. In an emergency, it is not too critical, but then again neither  
is the IDing requirement. Under normal conditions, finding a place on 2 meteers  
to bring your crossbanding out is quite difficult (without creating MANY  
enemies).

>  
>  
>  
>>  
>> cheers,  
>> Dan  
>> --  
>> \*-----\*  
>> \* Daniel D. Todd            Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa            \*  
>> \*                            Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu                \*  
>> \*                            Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102               \*  
>> \*                            Davis CA 95616                            \*



```
>> *-----*
>> *   The only thing I can officially say for the University is:   *
>> *   What I say is in no way related to oficial University policy *
>> *-----*
>>
>
>
>Dan Pickersgill  N8PKV |   Pots have handles,   | 'Climage is what we
>dan@mystis.wariat.org |Magazines have personals,| expect, weather is
>ac447@po.cwru.edu    |   Hams have names.   | what we get.' -L. Long
```

--

```
-----
Daniel Senie                Internet:    dts@world.std.com
Daniel Senie Consulting      n1jeb@world.std.com
508-365-5352                Compuserve:  74176,1347
```

```
-----
Date: Sun, 20 Feb 1994 08:29:28 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu
```

```
References <2juc20$n7n@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <2k672t$1op@vixen.cso.uiuc.edu>,
<2k68im$am6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>
Subject : Bad Radiographers (was: Dan Pickersgill - USENET POSTS)
```

In article <2k68im\$am6@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (A great x ray technician!) writes:

```
>
>--
>Radiographers who are able to use a radiographic machine well are
>great assets to the health care facility in which they are employed.
>
> --Dianne C. DeVos, "Basic Principles of Radiographic Exposure"
```

What an unusual statement. Did she mean to imply that there are some radiographers who are NOT able to use a radiographic machine? Frightening.

Jeff NH6IL

```
-----
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #76
*****
```